

Lead Entity Advisory Group
February 4, 2004
SeaTac WA
Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	Shirley Solomon, Skagit Watershed Council, Chair John Sims, Quinault Nation LE Doug Osterman, King County WRIA 9, Vice Chair Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE Amy Hatch-Winecka, Thurston, Mason LE
Others Present:	Kristi Silver, King County WRIA 8 Roy Huberd, Pierce County Dave McClure, Klickitat County Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Betsy Lyons, The Nature Conservancy Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB Rollie Geppert, IAC/SRFB Kristi Lynett, WDFW Brian Walsh, WDFW Randy Carman, WDFW Marnie Tyler, WDFW
LEAG Members Absent:	Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board (excused) Judy Phelps, Chelan County Citizens Committee Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (attempted by phone)
Introductions	Round table introductions. The group welcomed the newest LEAG member, Amy Hatch-Winecka.
Approval of Nov Notes	Approved.
Chair Report	Shirley reported that she attended the last SRFB meeting and relayed LEAG's concerns and comments. Unfortunately she missed the last ITF meeting, but 3 other LEs were present, including 2 LEAG members.
Staff Report Brian Walsh, WDFW	Brian introduced Marnie Tyler, WDFW's new Salmon Recovery Coordinator. Marnie expressed the Department's continued support for locally driven salmon recovery process, including LEs, their strategies and habitat work schedules. She hopes that regional planning can provide context for LE work; both expanded to the ESU scale, and focused at RFEG project level. Marnie is interested in a dialogue about WDFW support, both through the WSTs as well as headquarters staff. Brian attended the ITF meeting.

WDFW is working to clarify LE Boundaries which will be used to determine allocation of funds (shoreline and nearshore miles). The Dept needs to verify we have the most up to date mapped coverage, as some LEs have more current information. It is important to have map information that is consistent and the same scale. First the polygon area will be finalized, then WDFW will look at hydrolayer and shoreline information. We will seek verification and concurrence with all LEs before the "final" map is produced and mile determinations occurs.

Over the past month Brian has made some field visits to LEs, and will continue to do so. These meetings are very informal and are intended to strengthen communication and awareness of issues.

Brian passed out the final version of "Outline for Salmon Recovery Plans", as well as the letter from Gov. Locke to NOAA Fisheries Regional Administrator Bob Lohn and the response letter from Lohn to Locke.

Jim Fox,
IAC

Jim reported that there are no specific bills affecting LEs. One bill prohibits SRFB from giving acquisition funds to 5 counties with more than 75% of lands in public ownership. This bill probably won't make it far through the legislative circuit. This bill reflects the undercurrent this session of a concern about acquiring public land. The message to the legislature is that the Salmon Recovery Act set up a process for restoring and protecting salmon through a locally driven citizen based process. Therefore, it is Important that citizen's committees represent the real values of community.

The Budget provisio capping SRFB acquisition dollars can be amended. It is possible to either repeal restriction or change to %. All legislative members, both believers and non, need to know that most acquisition occurs to undertake massive restoration.

As of today, the SRFB has 26 million in hand. This includes FFY04 and 03-05 state. We don't know FFY05 funding yet, and may not for a year.

Acquisition Legislation

Besty Lyons from The Nature Conservancy gave an update on efforts to unrestrict the new legislatively mandated SRFB acquisition policy. Lead Entities Coordinators whose boundaries overlap influential legislators were asked to educate them on the importance of local decision-making about priorities. She feels that this budget language has a decent chance of getting modified.

5th Round Policies and Process

LEAG walked through the issues from the ITF's January 8th Meeting Summary document. Comments were documented as follows: *(Each comment listed below does not necessarily represent a consensus concern, only one that was expressed by at least one individual at the meeting.)*

1) Regional Planning / Prioritization

- Make 2% contingent upon deliverables
- \$5.1 million already allocated to regions for ESA planning
- Why add \$ when strategy of regions will be stronger – presumably improves performance of project list in competitive portion
- 4% too high
- Other factors already account for regional aspect; risk of double counting
- All LEs should take it upon themselves to communicate their concerns to SRFB directly

2) Project List Fit to Strategy

- How were multipliers developed?
- Need to simplify scoring
- Community weighting too high
- Community values requires more understanding
- SRFB no longer funds education projects, yet education is key for addressing community issues

3) Use of Review Panel / Scores

- Approaches 2 & 3 not transparent
- Approach 3 allows “human” element
- Concern about manipulation of process at the end
- Interested in seeing potential criteria for last 10% (3rd increment) SRFB discretion.

4) New Definitions of Benefit and Certainty*

5) Criteria to be Used by Technical Advisors*

6) Puget Sound Nearshore*

* Question/Answer Only

**LEAG
Effectiveness**

LEAG discussions surrounding 5th Round issues highlighted the need to re-evaluate how LEAG makes decisions and conveys recommendations. Shirley asked the group if they would be interested in a retreat to explore ways to improve the effectiveness of LEAG. The group brainstormed some questions to frame the overall discussion.

- Review policies and procedures
- Who do we advise?
- Who are we/what is the ideal make-up?
- How does IAC/SRFB view LEAG?
- What is the fit with salmon recovery?
- Need to improve coordination between DFW and IAC
- LEAG involvement in forums and legislature
- How LEAG makes decisions and communicates them
- Need better info on budgets (Tim Smith)
- Should LEAG membership be open to all?
- What are expectations?
- Time and Energy requirements
- Better to spend time influencing LEAG or SRFB?
- What difference has LEAG made?

DRAFT

- What do LE's need from LEAG?
- How to improve effectiveness?

NEXT MEETING:
LEAG Retreat; 10 a.m. April 16, 2004, Location TBA